

1 KAMALA D. HARRIS
Attorney General of California
2 MARC D. GREENBAUM
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
3 GILLIAN E. FRIEDMAN
Deputy Attorney General
4 State Bar No. 169207
300 So. Spring Street, Suite 1702
5 Los Angeles, CA 90013
Telephone: (213) 897-2564
6 Facsimile: (213) 897-2804
Attorneys for Complainant
7

8 **BEFORE THE**
DENTAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA
9 **DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS**
10 **STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

11 In the Matter of the Accusation Against:

Case No. **DBC 2012-38**

12 **SVETLANA Y. LILJEGREN**
13 **2829 Laurel Canyon Place**
14 **Los Angeles, CA 90046**

A C C U S A T I O N

15 **Dental License No. 50778**

16 Respondent.

17
18 Complainant alleges:

19 **PARTIES**

20 1. Richard DeCuir (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in his official capacity
21 as the Executive Officer of the Dental Board of California, Department of Consumer Affairs.

22 2. On or about July 14, 2003, the Dental Board of California issued Dental License
23 Number 50778 to Svetlana Y. Liljegren (Respondent). The Dental License was in full force and
24 effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on June 30, 2013, unless
25 renewed.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

JURISDICTION

3. This Accusation is brought before the Dental Board of California (Board), Department of Consumer Affairs, under the authority of the following laws. All section references are to the Business and Professions Code unless otherwise indicated.

4. Section 1670 states:

"Any licentiate may have his license revoked or suspended or be reprimanded or be placed on probation by the board for unprofessional conduct, or incompetence, or gross negligence, or repeated acts of negligence in his or her profession, or for the issuance of a license by mistake, or for any other cause applicable to the licentiate provided in this chapter. The proceedings under this article shall be conducted in accordance with Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 11500) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code, and the board shall have all the powers granted therein."

5. Section 125.3, subdivision (a), states, in pertinent part:

"Except as otherwise provided by law, in any order issued in resolution of a disciplinary proceeding before any board within the department . . . the board may request the administrative law judge to direct a licentiate found to have committed a violation or violations of the licensing act to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of the case."

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

6. On March 12, 2009, while Respondent was employed at Dental Max dental office located in West Covina, California, Respondent performed dental treatment on patient L.P. The treatment included an initial full mouth examination, prophylaxis, full mouth radiograph and composite fillings on teeth #12, 13, 14 (2 fillings), 15, 18 and 19.

7. On March 13, 2009, Respondent again performed dental treatment on L.P. wherein she placed composite fillings on teeth #2, 3, 4, 5, 30 and 31.

///

///

///

1 8. On March 19, 2009, L.P. returned to Dental Max for treatment by Respondent where
2 L.P. had a complaint of pain. Respondent placed an antimicrobial agent (Arestin) in the
3 crevicular tissue around teeth #14 and 15.

4 9. On March 21, 2009, L.P. again returned to Dental Max for treatment by Respondent
5 for pain and was given an anti-microbial mouth rinse (Peridex) and an antibiotic prescription of
6 amoxicilian.

7 10. On April 14, 2009, L.P. returned to Dental Max for treatment by Respondent. This
8 was L.P.'s final office visit.

9 11. In December 2009, L.P. transferred to the dental office of Dr. Ezaki. Dr. Ezaki
10 correctly diagnosed that L.P. had an endodontic problem with tooth #15 and Dr. Ezaki referred
11 the patient for root canal treatment.

12 12. Dr. Ezaki also found that L.P. has extensive caries problems and recommended that
13 numerous crowns be placed. Composite fillings on teeth #13 and #14 that had been placed by
14 Respondent in March 2009 were either broken, cracked or undermined by caries internally.

15 13. On or about August 2, 2010, the Dental Board of California made a request to
16 Respondent to provide dental records for L.P. pursuant to Business and Professions Code section
17 1684.1(a)(1) no later than August 18, 2010. Respondent produced dental records for L.P. with a
18 declaration dated September 12, 2010.

19 14. On or about April 30, 2012, the Dental Board made a request for dental records for
20 L.P. to Dental Max where Respondent had been employed at the time that she was treating L.P.
21 The records provided by Dental Max included six (6) dental records that were previously
22 undisclosed by Respondent. Moreover, in comparing the records from Dental Max to those
23 records that were produced by Respondent, it appeared that the dental documents produced by
24 Respondent had been altered in that they included backdated signatures where no such signatures
25 appeared on the records retained by Dental Max.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

2 **(Negligence and Unprofessional Conduct)**

3 15. Respondent's conduct constitutes cause for disciplinary action pursuant to Business
4 and Professions Code section 1670 in that she has engaged in unprofessional conduct and/or
5 committed repeated acts of negligence as follows:

6 16. On March 12, 2009, Respondent excessively prescribed treatment in the replacement
7 of 13 existing amalgam fillings with composite fillings.

8 17. Respondent failed to obtain prior written consent from L.P. for the replacement of 13
9 existing amalgam fillings with composite fillings on March 12-13, 2009.

10 18. On March 12-13, 2009, Respondent replaced 13 amalgam fillings with composite
11 fillings where some of the fillings were still in satisfactory condition, exhibiting a lack of
12 evidence based dentistry.

13 19. Respondent's placement of several composite fillings in March 2009 included several
14 that failed a few months later requiring eventual retreatment to be replaced in December 2009.

15 20. Respondent failed to comply with the standard of care for all new patients when she
16 failed to perform and record a periodontal evaluation and diagnosis. Respondent asserted that
17 there were 6 mm pockets around teeth #14 and #15 without making a record of such periodontal
18 probings and/or analysis. Moreover, Respondent's performing of a "regular" prophylaxis in her
19 evaluation of L.P. was inconsistent with the foregoing findings as a "periodontal" prophylaxis
20 should have been performed based on the above.

21 21. Respondent misdiagnosed tooth sensitivity that was the subject of L.P.'s initial
22 complaint as a periodontal problem when in fact it was an endodontic problem.

23 22. Respondent failed to comply with the standard of care where she should have initially
24 performed a pulp testing where L.P. complained about increasing sensitivity in the upper left
25 posterior teeth, and the initial x-rays showed a very deep old filling sitting in extremely close
26 proximity to the pulp of chamber of tooth #15.

27 ///

28 ///

23. Respondent failed to comply with the standard of care where she altered L.P.'s dental records including signing and backdating dental forms as described more fully in paragraphs 13 and 14 above.

PRAAYER

WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged, and that following the hearing, the Dental Board of California issue a decision:

1. Revoking or suspending Dental License Number 50778, issued to Svetlana Y. Liljegren

2. Ordering Svetlana Y. Liljegren to pay the Dental Board of California the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of this case, and, if placed on probation, the costs of probation monitoring;

3. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.

DATED:

10.17.12

RICHARD DECUIR
Executive Officer
Dental Board of California
Department of Consumer Affairs
State of California
Complainant

LA2012507761
51166875.doc